

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/672,022	ULEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Zachary M. Pape	2835	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Zachary M. Pape. (3)_____.

(2) Carl R. Wesolowski (40,372). (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 16 June 2005.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 17,21 and 24.

Identification of prior art discussed: N/A.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner contact Mr. Wesolowski to discuss some questions on claims listed above. Beginning with claim 17, the examiner asked for clarification as to the difference between a through-hole and a passage hole. Secondly, with respect to claim 21, the examiner noted to Mr. Wesolowski that the phrase, "wherein front and rear ends of an upper surface of the passage hole are configured to have inclined surfaces, respectively. Mr. Wesolowski and the examiner agreed that the way the phrase was worded was incorrect, which was noted on the present office action. Finally, with respect to claim 24, the examiner noted to Mr. Wesolowski that the means for language was incorrect, which is reflected in the present office action. Additionally Mr. Wesolowski answered any questions the examiner had with respect to the drawings..